

REMARKS

The objection to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.183(a) is noted. The specification has been changed to eliminate reference to elements 12a and 12b, making it unnecessary to file revised drawings. Should the Examiner believe some other action is in order, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

Claims 1, 8, and 12 have been amended and new claims 13 to 22 have been added better to point out that which applicants regard as their invention. Claims 2 and 9 have been canceled; thus, the claims before the Examiner for consideration are claims 1, 3 to 8 and 10 to 22.

The rejection of claims 1, 2 to 9, and 11 under 35 USC 102 as anticipated by Yamashita et al. JP '187, if applied to the claims as amended, is respectfully traversed. Claims 1 and 8 specify, in addition to the limitations recited in the original claim, that a part of the tab corresponding to the corrosion-resistant layer has been degreased; support for the degreasing operation is found in the specification at least at page 8, lines 2 to 4; page 8, line 16 to page 9, line 3, and the working

examples. The reference does not teach or suggest such a treatment and the rejection should be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 1, 2, and 7 to 9 under 35 USC 102 as anticipated by Kahata et al. JP '788, if applied to the claims as amended, is also respectfully traversed. This reference, as Yamashita et al. JP '187, does not teach or suggest the claimed degreasing operation and the claims are likewise patentable.

The rejection of claims 3 and 10 under 35 USC 103 as unpatentable over Yamashita et al. JP '187 further in view of Affinito '746 is respectfully traversed. The secondary reference does not teach what is lacking in the primary reference discussed above and the reference should be withdrawn as well.

The rejection of claim 12 under 35 USC 103 as unpatentable over Morris '206 in view of Yamashita et al. JP '187, if applied to the claim as amended, is respectfully traversed. The references do not teach or suggest the feature added to the claim, namely forming the film with a dried solution applied to the tab body and heating that film at a temperature not lower than 180°C to form a corrosion-resistant layer. That claimed

feature is supported by the disclosure at least at page 9, lines 17 to 21, and page 24, lines 32 to 36.

The rejection of claims 3 and 10 under 35 USC 103 as unpatentable over Kahata et al. JP '788 further in view of Affinito '746 is also respectfully traversed. As indicated above, the primary reference does not teach or suggest a degreasing operation and the deficiency thereof is not overcome by the teachings of the secondary reference.

The rejection of claims 4 and 11 under 35 USC 103 as unpatentable over Kahata et al. JP '788 further in view of Mori '135 is also respectfully traversed. Mori '135 is cited to show the use of a triazine thiol; the reference, however, does not provide that which is lacking in the primary reference as discussed above. The rejection should be withdrawn also.

New claims 13 to 20 are battery claims wherein the independent claims (13 and 17) specify that the corrosion resistant layer of the tab is formed by using a processing solution prepared by mixing a phenolic resin, a chromium fluoride (3) compound, and phosphoric acid; the specification supports this feature of the claimed invention at least at page 9, lines 15 to 17, page 18, lines 5 to 7 and 30 to 33, and page

Serial No. 10/009,488

24, lines 30 to 32. Claim 17 is a combination of claims 1 and 13.

New claims 21 and 22 are directed to metal tabs, both calling for a processing solution of the particular mixture discussed above.

The Examiner is thanked for indicating that certified copies of the priority documents have been received from the International Bureau.

The Examiner is requested to list all references provided on the PTO-1449 submitted with the Information Disclosure Statement filed December 13, 2001. The Examiner is also requested to review the file to see if the Assignment, which was also filed that same day, is still there and has not been sent on to the appropriate part of the USPTO for processing.

In view of the foregoing revisions and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 3 to 8, and 10 to 22 are in condition for allowance and a USPTO paper to those ends is earnestly solicited.

Serial No. 10/009,488

The Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned if additional changes are required prior to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P.



Charles A. Wendel
Registration No. 24,453

December 2, 2007
Date

CAW/ch
Attorney Docket No.: DAIN:658

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P.
1421 Prince Street
Suite 210
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-2805
Telephone: (703) 739-0220